



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/565,515	01/23/2006	Stephen Augustyn	PB60373USW	2676
23347	7590	07/08/2011	EXAMINER	
GLAXOSMITHKLINE GLOBAL PATENTS FIVE MOORE DR., PO BOX 13398 MAIL STOP: C.2111F RESEARCH TRIANGLE PARK, NC 27709-3398			OSTRUP, CLINTON T	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3771	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/08/2011	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

USCIPRTP@GSK.COM
ELAINE.X.MARTENS@GSK.COM
PATRICIA.T.WILSON@GSK.COM

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/565,515	AUGUSTYN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	CLINTON T. OSTRUP	3771	

All Participants:

(1) CLINTON T. OSTRUP.

(2) ROBERT J. SMITH.

Date of Interview: 22 June 2011

Status of Application: Amended

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Time: 10:45 AM+/-

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____.

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

None

Claims discussed:

None

Prior art documents discussed:

None

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/CLINTON T. OSTRUP/
Examiner, Art Unit 3771

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner informed Mr. Smith that the correction of inventorship submitted 6/21/2011 was not in compliance with 37 C.F.R. 1.48(b) because it lacked a fee as required by 37 C.F.R. § 1.17(i). Moreover, the examiner asked for clarification of the correction of inventorship which lists Paul Rand, Michael Davies, Stephen Augustyn, and Stephen Harvey as inventors, and deletes Mark Palmer and Alan Wilson as inventors, because the inventorship and declaration filed 1/23/2006 lists seven people as inventors, one of which is not listed in the correction of inventorship submitted 6/21/2011, namely Gary Crosby. It was agreed that an Ex Parte Quayle Action would be mailed in order to allow time to determine the inventorship status of Gary Crosby. .